

REMARKS

1. Claim 24 is objected to because a space is allegedly missing in part iiib between "polynucleotide" and "comprising". We were unable to locate the offending text. We authorize an examiner's amendment to correct it.

2. In response to OA §5(A), we have amended claim 1(ii) to make explicit the relationship between the ds polynucleotide and the tag. The tag is "obtained" because the nicked polynucleotide comprises it. "Obtaining" is not really a separate step and hence step (iii) is converted to a "thus" clause.

The term "tag" refers to a short unique sequence used to quickly identify the larger tagged molecule. See P3, L27-30; P6, L25-P7, L19.

3. In response to OA §5(B), we have amended claims 14 and 40 to eliminate the language of preference. In the case of 14 the preferences were excised. Note that one of the preferences was already recited in claim 15, and the other is in new claim 106. In the case of 40, the preferences were excised and moved to new claims 107 and 108.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\g-i\hoib\Pedersen1A\pto amend1.wpd